UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/550,324	09/23/2005	Tetsuya Tachikawa	2352.009	2069	
23405 7590 03/11/2009 HESLIN ROTHENBERG FARLEY & MESITI PC			EXAMINER		
5 COLUMBIA ALBANY, NY		CHIN, CHRISTOPHER L			
ALDANI, NI	12203	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
		1641			
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			03/11/2009	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/550,324	TACHIKAWA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	

	Christopher L. Chin	1641	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>12 February 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FO	R ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apperent for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	the same day as filing a Notice of A replies: (1) an amendment, affidavited al (with appeal fee) in compliance w	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Ar no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I) MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f)	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	date of the final rejection	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1: ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origin	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in completing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENDMENTS 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. ☑ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b (a) ☑ They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	nsideration and/or search (see NOT		cause
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or	er form for appeal by materially rec		ne issues for
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a c NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1		ected claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):	21. See attached Notice of Non-Cor	mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).	•	•	_
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:	· —	l be entered and an ex	planation of
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1.3 and 5-7</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to of showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	ıl and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
 The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> 			ce because:
12. ⊠ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. ☐ Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). <u>dated 3/</u>	<u>6/09</u>	
	/Christopher L. Chin/ Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 1641	

Continuation of 3. NOTE: In claim 3, the recitation of "said fluid" lacks antecedent support.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicants argue that Arita et al requires boiling of sample to obtain a monomeric form of adiponectin for accurate measurement of how much adiponectin is present in the sample. Applicants assert that the polyclonal antibody produced by Arita et al cannot be used to accurately measure adiponectin in a sample without boiling the sample. However, the instant specification teaches the use of recombinant adiponectin to generate the polyclonal antibodies in the instant invention (see page 15) which is the same manner in which Arita et al make their polyclonal antibodies. Given that the polyclonal antibodies in Arita et al and the instant invention are made in the same manner, the polyclonal antibodies in Arita et al should bind to adiponectin in the same manner required in the instant invention. With respect to claim 3, even with the added limitation of no pretreatment step, the amended claim is only directed to analyzing adiponectin and not a quantitative measurement. With respect to claim 7, even if the claim were "closed" with the "consisting of" language, the lack of a boiling step still results in measurement of some form of adiponectin. Claim 7 does not stipulate measurement of a monomeric form of adiponectin which would appear to require the boiling step disclosed by Arita et al.